

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Figs. 3 and 5 and replace the original sheets with Figs. 3 and 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

This Supplemental Amendment is being filed in response to the March 9, 2008 Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification, claims 1 and 19 and the drawings are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. The specification, including the Abstract, is amended to correct informalities. The drawings are amended to correct informalities. Support for amendments to claims 1 and 19 can be found, for example, on page 14, line 27 - page 16, line 8 of the specification. No new matter is added. Claims 14-18 are provisionally withdrawn from consideration as drawn to a non-elected group of claims. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Davis at the interview held December 12, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview. Specifically, during the interview, discussion was had regarding rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Additionally, Applicants' representative provides the following remarks in consideration of the Examiner's clarifying remarks during the interview.

The Office Action, on page 2, indicates that claims 14-18 are withdrawn from further consideration. The Office Action further asserts that Applicants' election is considered to be without traverse for allegedly not complying with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) because Applicants' arguments amounts to a general allegation that does not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the requirement for restriction. Applicants maintain that the election is with traverse. Applicants argued that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. As such, the Office Action has not met its burden in

levying the Requirement. Moreover, claims 14-18 were previously examined as indicated in the January 17, 2007 Office Action. As such, because these claims have already been examined, it is questionable how the Office Action could now assert that (1) there would be a serious burden on the Examiner and (2) improper. Only claim 1 was amended in the response filed on April 17, 2007. In this regard, no additional burden has been imposed through prosecution upon the Examiner with respect to claims 14-18.

For at least these reasons, Applicants maintain that the election is with traverse and the Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn.

The Office Action, on page 3, objects to the drawings for containing typographical errors. The drawings are amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on pages 4 and 5, objects to the Abstract and the disclosure because of various informalities. The Abstract is amended to obviate the objection. With respect to the disclosure of the application, Applicants amend the disclosure as suggested by the Examiner with respect to "peripheral," "amount," "the RAM 14, HDD 16," and "in FIG. 9, structural elements." With respect to the Office Action's assertions regarding vagueness and the informal and/or narrative nature of certain portions of the specification, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand these portions of the specification, and the standard imposed by the Office Action for amendment of these portions of the specification is not supported by any rule, or the law. In other words, there is nothing objectionable in the specification being any of vague, informal or narrative . Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 5, objects to claim 13 for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that claim 13

fails to further limit the subject matter of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 13 further limits independent claim 1 because it recites features that are not recited in claim 1. For example, claim 13 recites "wherein the storage controller decides the size of the job data distributed to the second storage device." Claim 1 merely recites distributing the plurality of parts between the first and second storage devices, based on available space in the second storage device. As such, claim 13 further limits claim 1. Withdrawal of the objection is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 6, rejects claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, in particular lines 10-14, are amended to obviate the §112 rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action, on page 7, rejects claims 1-13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over KR 1993-0008657 to Jin et al. (hereinafter "Jin") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145218 to Hutchison. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, a job controller for permitting execution of a following job without waiting for completion of deletion of the part of the job data file stored in the first storage device when the part of the job data file stored in the second storage device is deleted by the deletion controller. The combination of Jin and Hutchison would not have suggested these features.

The Office Action concedes that Jin fails to disclose or suggest the claimed deletion controller. The Office Action, however, asserts that Hutchison remedies this deficiency. Despite this assertion, the combination of Jin and Hutchison would not have suggested the combination of all of the features positively recited in claim 1, as the combination fails to at least suggest the above-recited feature.

Hutchison teaches deleting an entire data file. For example, Hutchison, at paragraph [0032], teaches erasing the data of a file by overwriting the data on the file; and Hutchison, at paragraph [0034], teaches erasing some files and saving other files. More specifically, in paragraph [0034], Hutchison teaches that a system in the computer can be designed to not erase files associated with the print job in progress. However, Hutchison provides no disclosure that indicates that the print job is executed without waiting for deleting an entire data file or deleting some files and saving other files, nor does Hutchison teach that any other job is executed without waiting for completion of deletion. As such, because there is no teaching or suggestion in Hutchison of the job controller for permitting execution of a following job without waiting for completion of deletion, and Jin, as acknowledged by the Office Action does not teach a deletion controller for deleting the part of the job data file stored on the second storage device, by the storage controller, when a prescribed deletion condition is satisfied, the combination of Jin and Hutchison would not have suggested at least the above-recited features. Thus, the combination of Jin and Hutchison would not have suggested the combination of all of the features positively recited in claim 1. Further, claims 2-13 also would not have been suggested by the combination of applied references for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on claim 1, as well as for the additional features that each of these claims recites.

Independent claim 19 recites, among other features, permitting execution of a following job without waiting for completion of deletion of the part of the job data file stored in the first storage device when the part of the job data file stored in the second storage device is deleted. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, the combination of Jin and Hutchison would not have suggested these features. Thus, the combination would not have suggested the combination of all of the features positively recited in claim 19.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13 and 19 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-19 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkhimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB/rle

Attachments:

Amended Abstract
Replacement Sheets (Figs. 3 and 5)

Date: March 11, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--